

REMARKS

The last Office Action of August 8, 2008 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 12-20 are pending in the application. No amendment to the claims and specification has been made. No fee is due.

Claims 1-7, 10, 12-13, 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,443,295 to Hill in view of published U.S. Pat. Appl. No. 2003/0139129 to Clarke.

Claims 8-9, 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill in view of Clarke, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,399,598 to Page et al.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 for the following reasons:

In order to bridge the absence of teaching in Hill of the claim limitation "*said hollow-cylindrical body being formed about its outer circumference with spaced-apart groups of fixing elements in the form of outwardly projecting elevations to thereby define between the groups of fixing elements peripheral channels or passageways in longitudinal direction of the hollow-cylindrical body for circulation of a coolant*", the Examiner applies the Clarke reference and refers in particular to the illustrations of Figs. 2-4. The Clarke reference is directed to a poultry processing hub and belt assembly. Figs. 2-4 show the presence of a pinion (141) having an outer surface in the form of serration (145) for engagement of a timing belt (147) provided with a plurality of serrations (149) which mate the pulley serrations (145). This intermeshing engagement between the pulley and timing belt eliminates belt slippage, as previously encountered with the use of flat or V-shaped belts (paragraph [0024]).

While the Examiner is entitled to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation, the interpretation by the Examiner advanced here is not reasonable.

The claim limitation as duplicated above relates to the formation of elevations which are spaced about the outer surface of the hollow-cylindrical body to form passageways **for circulation of a coolant**. Clarke fails to disclose passageways through which a coolant can be conveyed. In fact, in order to realize the elimination of belt slippage, the belt serrations and the pulley serrations closely mesh in a form-fitting manner so that no fluid could conceivably be conveyed therein.

Obviousness requires a suggestion of all the elements in a claim and a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the elements in a way the claimed new invention does. *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1741 [82 USPQ2d 1385] (2007). It is applicant's contention that the Examiner has not identified all the elements of claim 1, nor provided any reason that would have prompted the skilled worker to make the combination, as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, an artisan having common sense at the time the invention was made would not have reasonably considered embedding serrations, as disclosed in Clarke, within the existing Hill pulley drum in the manner suggested by the examiner.

Applicant also submits that Clarke does not refer in any way to "cooling", while Hill provides only a single reference to cooling in col. 1 lines 51-54 to state that the pulley drum has an **interior** containing a lubricant to cool the motor and gearing. In contrast thereto, the present invention provides a cooling system on the **outside**. Furthermore, a combination of Hill and Clarke also fails to disclose a positional relationship between the serrations and a seal, as set forth in claim 1, which states that the elastic connection device is held in place by the fixing elements. Thus, a combination of Clarke and Hill would not produce the present invention also in this respect but merely results in serrations inside the pulley drum, with seals disposed in separate grooves between the peripheral surface of the end plate and the interior surface of the pulley drum. The seals would not be held in place by the serrations.

For the reasons set forth above, it is applicant's contention that neither Hill nor Clarke, nor a combination thereof teaches or suggests the features of the present invention, as recited in claim 1.

As for the rejection of the retained dependent claims, these claims depend on claim 1, share its presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that these claims should also be allowed.

Applicant has also carefully scrutinized the further cited prior art and finds it without any relevance to the claims on file. It is thus felt that no specific discussion thereof is necessary.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____


Henry M. Feiereisen
Agent For Applicant
Reg. No: 31,084

Date: November 10, 2008
708 Third Avenue
Suite 1501
New York, N.Y. 10017
(212)244-5500
HMF:af